

Cherwell District Council

Accounts, Audit and Risk Committee

24 January 2018

Treasury Management Mid-Year Report for the 6 months ended 30 September 2017

Report of the Chief Finance Officer

This report is public

Purpose of report

To receive information on treasury management performance and compliance with treasury management policy for 2017-18 as required by the Treasury Management Code of Practice.

This report would normally be presented in November, but was postponed to a later date.

The Council's 2017-18 Treasury Management Strategy was revised in December 2017 so future reports will correspond to the new strategy, but this report corresponds to the original strategy that was in place at 30 September 2017.

1.0 Recommendations

The meeting is recommended:

1.1 To note the contents of the mid-year Treasury Management Report.

2.0 Introduction

In 2013 the Council adopted the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's Treasury Management in the Public Services: Code of Practice 2011 Edition (the CIPFA Code) which requires the Council to approve treasury management semi-annual and annual reports.

The Council's treasury management strategy for 2017/18 was approved at a meeting of the Council on in February 2017. The Council has borrowed and invested substantial sums of money and is therefore exposed to financial risks including the loss of invested funds and the revenue effect of changing interest rates. The successful identification, monitoring and control of risk are therefore central to the Council's treasury management strategy.

3.0 Report Details

3.1 External Context (provided by Arlingclose – October 2017)

Economic backdrop: Commodity prices fluctuated over the period with oil falling below \$45 a barrel before inching back up to \$58 a barrel. UK Consumer Price Inflation (CPI) index rose with the data print for August showing CPI at 2.9%, its

highest since June 2013 as the fall in the value of sterling following the June 2016 referendum result continued to feed through into higher import prices. The new inflation measure CPIH, which includes owner occupiers' housing costs, was at 2.7%.

The unemployment rate fell to 4.3%, its lowest since May 1975, but the squeeze on consumers intensified as average earnings grew at 2.5%, below the rate of inflation. Economic activity expanded at a much slower pace as evidenced by Q1 and Q2 GDP growth of 0.2% and 0.3% respectively. With the dominant services sector accounting for 79% of GDP, the strength of consumer spending remains vital to growth, but with household savings falling and real wage growth negative, there are concerns that these will be a constraint on economic activity in the second half of calendar 2017.

The Bank of England made no change to monetary policy at its meetings in the first half of the financial year. The vote to keep Bank Rate at 0.25% narrowed to 5-3 in June highlighting that some MPC members were more concerned about rising inflation than the risks to growth. Although at September's meeting the Committee voted 7-2 in favour of keeping Bank Rate unchanged, the MPC changed their rhetoric, implying a rise in Bank Rate in "the coming months". The Council's treasury advisor Arlingclose is not convinced the UK's economic outlook justifies such a move at this stage, but the Bank's interpretation of the data seems to have shifted.

In contrast, near-term global growth prospects improved. The US Federal Reserve increased its target range of official interest rates in June for the second time in 2017 by 25bps (basis points) to between 1% and 1.25% and, despite US inflation hitting a soft patch with core CPI at 1.7%, a further similar increase is expected in its December 2017 meeting. The Fed also announced confirmed that it would be starting a reversal of its vast Quantitative Easing programme and reduce the \$4.2 trillion of bonds it acquired by initially cutting the amount it reinvests by \$10bn a month.

Geopolitical tensions escalated in August as the US and North Korea exchanged escalating verbal threats over reports about enhancements in North Korea's missile programme. The provocation from both sides helped wipe off nearly \$1 trillion from global equity markets but benefited safe-haven assets such as gold, the US dollar and the Japanese yen. Tensions remained high, with North Korea's threat to fire missiles towards the US naval base in Guam, its recent missile tests over Japan and a further testing of its latent nuclear capabilities.

Prime Minister Theresa May called an unscheduled General Election in June, to resolve uncertainty but the surprise result has led to a minority Conservative government in coalition with the Democratic Unionist Party. This clearly results in an enhanced level of political uncertainty. Although the potential for a so-called hard Brexit is diminished, lack of clarity over future trading partnerships, in particular future customs agreements with the rest of the EU block, is denting business sentiment and investment. The reaction from the markets on the UK election's outcome was fairly muted, business confidence now hinges on the progress (or not) on Brexit negotiations, the ultimate 'divorce bill' for the exit and whether new trade treaties and customs arrangements are successfully concluded to the UK's benefit.

In the face of a struggling economy and Brexit-related uncertainty, Arlingclose expects the Bank of England to take only a very measured approach to any

monetary policy tightening, any increase will be gradual and limited as the interest rate backdrop will have to provide substantial support to the UK economy through the Brexit transition.

Financial markets: Gilt yields displayed significant volatility over the six-month period with the appearing change in sentiment in the Bank of England's outlook for interest rates, the push-pull from expectations of tapering of Quantitative Easing (QE) in the US and Europe and from geopolitical tensions, which also had an impact. The yield on the 5-year gilts fell to 0.35% in mid-June, but then rose to 0.80% by the end of September. The 10-year gilts similarly rose from their lows of 0.93% to 1.38% at the end of the quarter, and those on 20-year gilts from 1.62% to 1.94%.

The FTSE 100 nevertheless powered away reaching a record high of 7548 in May but dropped back to 7377 at the end of September. Money markets rates have remained low: 1-month, 3-month and 12-month LIBID rates have averaged 0.25%, 0.30% and 0.65% over the period from January to 21st September.

Credit background: UK bank credit default swaps continued their downward trend, reaching three-year lows by the end of June. Bank share prices have not moved in any particular pattern.

There were a few credit rating changes during the quarter. The significant change was the downgrade by Moody's to the UK sovereign rating in September from Aa1 to Aa2 which resulted in subsequent downgrades to sub-sovereign entities including local authorities. Moody's downgraded Standard Chartered Bank's long-term rating to A1 from Aa3 on the expectation that the bank's profitability will be lower following management's efforts to de-risk their balance sheet. The agency also affirmed Royal Bank of Scotland's and NatWest's long-term ratings at Baa1, placed Lloyds Bank's A1 rating on review for upgrade, revised the outlook of Santander UK plc, and Nationwide and Coventry building societies from negative to stable but downgraded the long-term rating of Leeds BS from A2 to A3. The agency downgraded long-term ratings of the major Canadian banks on the expectation of a more challenging operating environment and the ratings of the large Australian banks on its view of the rising risks from their exposure to the Australian housing market and the elevated proportion of lending to residential property investors.

S&P also revised Nordea Bank's outlook to stable from negative, whilst affirming their long-term rating at AA-. The agency also upgraded the long-term rating of ING Bank from A to A+.

Ring-fencing, which requires the larger UK banks to separate their core retail banking activity from the rest of their business, is expected to be implemented within the next year. In May, following Arlingclose's advice, the Council reduced the maximum duration of unsecured investments with Bank of Scotland, HSBC Bank and Lloyds Bank from 13 months to 6 months as until banks' new structures are finally determined and published, the different credit risks of the 'retail' and 'investment' banks cannot be known for certain.

The new EU regulations for Money Market Funds were finally approved and published in July and existing funds will have to be compliant by no later than 21st January 2019. The key features include Low Volatility NAV (LVNAV) Money Market Funds which will be permitted to maintain a constant dealing NAV, providing they meet strict new criteria and minimum liquidity requirements. MMFs will not be

prohibited from having an external fund rating (as had been suggested in draft regulations). Arlingclose expects most of the short-term MMFs it recommends to convert to the LVNAV structure and awaits confirmation from each fund.

3.2 Regulatory Updates

MiFID II: Local authorities are currently treated by regulated financial services firms as professional clients who can “opt down” to be treated as retail clients instead. But from 3rd January 2018, as a result of the second Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID II), local authorities will be treated as retail clients who can “opt up” to be professional clients, providing that they meet certain criteria. Regulated financial services firms include banks, brokers, advisers, fund managers and custodians, but only where they are selling, arranging, advising or managing designated investments. In order to opt up to professional, the Council must have an investment balance of at least £10 million and the person authorised to make investment decisions on behalf of the Council must have at least one year’s relevant professional experience. In addition, the firm must assess that that person has the expertise, experience and knowledge to make investment decisions and understand the risks involved.

The main additional protection for retail clients is a duty on the firm to ensure that the investment is “suitable” for the client. However, local authorities are not protected by the Financial Services Compensation Scheme nor are they eligible to complain to the Financial Ombudsman Service whether they are retail or professional clients. It is also likely that retail clients will face an increased cost and potentially restricted access to certain products including money market funds, pooled funds, treasury bills, bonds, shares and to financial advice. The Council has declined to opt down to retail client status in the past as the costs were thought to outweigh the benefits.

The Council currently meets the conditions to opt up to professional status and has done so in order to maintain their current MiFID status. However the criteria that need to be met are ongoing and therefore depend on a continuing investment balance of £10 million being held. As the Council is now a net borrower this may change and we could therefore lose our professional status.

CIPFA Consultation on Prudential and Treasury Management Codes: In February 2017 CIPFA canvassed views on the relevance, adoption and practical application of the Treasury Management and Prudential Codes and after reviewing responses launched a further consultation on changes to the codes in August with a deadline for responses of 30th September 2017.

The proposed changes to the Prudential Code include the production of a new high-level Capital Strategy report to full council which will cover the basics of the capital programme and treasury management. The prudential indicators for capital expenditure and the authorised borrowing limit would be included in this report but other indicators may be delegated to another committee. There are plans to drop certain prudential indicators, however local indicators are recommended for ring fenced funds (including the HRA) and for group accounts. Other proposed changes include applying the principles of the Code to subsidiaries.

Proposed changes to the Treasury Management Code include the potential for non-treasury investments such as commercial investments in properties in the definition

of “investments” as well as loans made or shares brought for service purposes. Another proposed change is the inclusion of financial guarantees as instruments requiring risk management and addressed within the Treasury Management Strategy. Approval of the technical detail of the Treasury Management Strategy may be delegated to a committee rather than needing approval of full Council. There are also plans to drop or alter some of the current treasury management indicators.

CIPFA intends to publish the two revised Codes towards the end of 2017 for implementation in 2018/19, although CIPFA plans to put transitional arrangements in place for reports that are required to be approved before the start of the 2018/19 financial year. The Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and CIPFA wish to have a more rigorous framework in place for the treatment of commercial investments as soon as is practical. It is understood that DCLG will be revising its Investment Guidance (and its MRP guidance) for local authorities in England; however there have been no discussions with the devolved administrations yet.

The revised CIPFA code was published in December 2017 and these are currently being digested and we are awaiting detailed advice from our advisers, Arlingclose, about how it will be implemented for 2018/19.

3.3 Local Context

On 31st March 2017, the Council had investments of £30.6m arising from its revenue and capital income and expenditure. The underlying need to borrow for capital purposes is measured by the Capital Financing Requirement (CFR), while usable reserves and working capital are the underlying resources available for investment. These factors are summarised in table 1 below.

Table 1: Balance Sheet Summary

	31.3.17 Actual £m
General Fund CFR	2.4
Less: Usable reserves	-21.5
Less: Working capital	-11.4
Net investments	-30.6

The Council’s current strategy is to maintain borrowing and investments below their underlying levels, sometimes known as internal borrowing, in order to reduce risk and keep interest costs low. The treasury management position as at 30th September 2017 and the change over the period is show in table 2 below.

Table 2: Treasury Management Summary

	31.3.17 Balance £m	Movement £m	30.9.17 Balance £m	30.9.17 Rate %
Long-term borrowing	0	0	0	-
Short-term borrowing	0	20	20	0.33
Total borrowing	0	20	20	0.33
Long-term investments*	12.9	4.5	17.4	-
Short-term investments	11.5	-9.0	2.5	0.21

Cash and cash equivalents	6.2	-4.3	1.9	0.18
Total investments	30.6	-8.8	21.8	0.19
Net borrowing / investments	30.6	-28.8	1.8	

*Long term investments of £12.9m/£17.4m are shares held in Graven Hill and are not 'treasury investments'

3.4 Borrowing Strategy during the half year

At 30/9/2017 the Council held £20m of loans, (an increase of £20m on 31/3/2017), as part of its strategy for funding previous years' capital programmes. The 30th September 2017 borrowing position is show in table 3 below.

Table 3: Borrowing Position

	31.3.17 Balance £m	Movement £m	30.9.17 Balance £m	30.9.17 Weighted average rate %
Public Works Loan Board	0	0	0	0
Banks (LOBO)	0	0	0	0
Banks (fixed-term)	0	0	0	0
Local authorities (long-term)	0	0	0	0
Local authorities (short-term)	0	20	20	0.33
Total borrowing	0	20	20	

The Council's chief objective when borrowing has been to strike an appropriately low risk balance between securing low interest costs and achieving cost certainty over the period for which funds are required, with flexibility to renegotiate loans should the Council's long-term plans change being a secondary objective.

In furtherance of these objectives new borrowing was kept to a minimum, whilst options for securing lower rates for longer term borrowing were reviewed. This strategy enabled the Council to reduce net borrowing costs (despite foregone investment income) and reduce overall treasury risk.

The "cost of carry" analysis performed by the Council's treasury management advisor Arlingclose did not indicate any value in borrowing in advance for future years' planned expenditure and therefore none was taken.

3.5 Investment Activity

The Council holds invested funds, representing income received in advance of expenditure plus balances and reserves held. During the first half of 2017/18 the Council's investment balance ranged between £2.6 and £29.2 million due to timing differences between income and expenditure. The investment position during the half year is shown in table 4 below.

Table 4: Investment Position

	31.3.17 Balance £m	Movement £m	30.9.17 Balance £m	30.9.17 Weighted average rate %
Banks & building societies (unsecured)	13.8	-11.2	2.6	0.23
Covered bonds (secured)				
Government (incl. local authorities)	0	0	0	0
Corporate bonds and loans	0	0	0	0
Money Market Funds	4.2	-2.4	1.8	0.14
Other Pooled Funds	0	0	0	
Total investments	18.0	-13.6	4.4	

Both the CIPFA Code and government guidance require the Council to invest its funds prudently, and to have regard to the security and liquidity of its investments before seeking the highest rate of return, or yield. The Council's objective when investing money is to strike an appropriate balance between risk and return, minimising the risk of incurring losses from defaults and the risk of receiving unsuitably low investment income.

Given the increasing risk and low returns from short-term unsecured bank investments, the Council would aspire to diversify into more secure and/or higher yielding asset classes. However, given the low level of funds available for longer-term investment and the high liquidity requirements, the Council's surplus cash is likely to remain invested in short-term instant-access bank deposits and money market funds.

3.6 Other Investment Activity

Although not currently classed as treasury management activities and therefore not covered by the CIPFA Code, the Council also holds £46.6m of investments in the form of shares in and loans to subsidiary companies

These non-treasury investments generate or are expected to generate a higher rate of return than earned on treasury investments, but reflects the additional risks to the Council of holding such investments.

If CIPFA's proposed amendments to the Treasury Management Code are adopted in the revised Code from 2018/19, these will henceforth be included in the expanded definition of "investments".

3.7 Performance Report

The Council measures the financial performance of its treasury management activities both in terms of its impact on the revenue budget and its relationship to benchmark interest rates, as shown in table 6 below.

Table 6: Performance

	Actual £k	Budget £k	Over/ Under £k	Actual %	Budget %	Over/ Under %

Total investment returns	25	34	-9	0.33	0.41	-0.08
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-------------	-------------	--------------

3.8 Compliance Report

The Chief Finance Officer is pleased to report that all treasury management activities undertaken during the first half of 2017/18 complied fully with the CIPFA Code of Practice and the Council's approved Treasury Management Strategy, specifically in respect of investment and debt limits.

3.9 Treasury Management Indicators

The Council measures and manages its exposures to treasury management risks using the following indicators. The Chief Finance Officer is pleased to report that all indicators were complied with during, and at the end of, the reporting period.

3.10 Outlook for the remainder of 2017/18 (provided by Arlingclose – October 2017)

The UK economy faces a challenging outlook as the minority government continues to negotiate the country's exit from the European Union. Both consumer and business confidence remain subdued. Household consumption growth, the driver of UK GDP growth, has softened following a contraction in real wages. Savings rates are at an all-time low and real earnings growth (i.e after inflation) struggles in the face of higher inflation.

The Bank of England's Monetary Policy Committee has changed its rhetoric, implying a rise in Bank Rate in "the coming months". Arlingclose is not convinced the UK's economic outlook justifies such a move at this stage, but the Bank's interpretation of the data seems to have shifted.

This decision is still very data dependant and Arlingclose is, for now, maintaining its central case for Bank Rate at 0.25% whilst introducing near-term upside risks to the forecast as shown below. Arlingclose's central case is for gilt yields to remain broadly stable in the across the medium term, but there may be near term volatility due to shifts in interest rate expectations.

	Dec-17	Mar-18	Jun-18	Sep-18	Dec-18	Mar-19	Jun-19	Sep-19	Dec-19	Mar-20	Jun-20	Sep-20	Dec-20
Official Bank Rate													
Upside risk	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
Arlingclose Central Case	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Downside risk	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25

4.0 Conclusion and Reasons for Recommendations

This report details the Treasury Performance for the Council for the half year ended 30 September 2017. The committee is recommended to note its contents.

5.0 Consultation

None.

6.0 Alternative Options and Reasons for Rejection

6.1 The following alternative options have been identified and rejected for the reasons as set out below.

Option 1: To request further information on the performance reported.

7.0 Implications

Financial and Resource Implications

7.1 Presentation of this report is in line with the CIPFA Code of Practice. There are no financial implications arising directly from any outcome of this report.

Comments checked by:

Sanjay Sharma, Interim Head of Finance

Sanjay.sharma@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk 01295 221564

Legal Implications

7.2 There are no legal implications arising directly from any outcome of this report.

Comments checked by:

Richard Hawtin, Law and Governance

richard.hawtin@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk 01295 221695

Risk Management Implications

7.3 It is essential that this report is considered by the Audit Committee as it demonstrates that the risk of not complying with the Council's Treasury Management Policy has been avoided.

Comments checked by:

Louise Tustian, Team Leader – Strategic Intelligence & Insight

louise.tustian@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk 01295 221786

Equality and Diversity

7.4 There are no equality and diversity implications from this report.

Comments checked by:

Caroline French, Corporate Policy & Projects Officer

caroline.french@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk 01295 221586

8.0 Decision Information

Wards Affected:

All wards are affected.

Links to Corporate Plan and Policy Framework:

Links to all elements of Corporate Plan.

Lead Councillor:

None.

Document Information

Background Papers	
None	
Report Author	Paul Sutton, Chief Finance Officer
Contact Information	paul.sutton@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk 0300 003 0106